APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/191,256	11/12/98	CASE	SA9-98-160

TM02/1026

NOREEN A KRALL
IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
5600 COTTLE ROAD (L2PA/0142)
SAN JOSE CA 95193

EXAMINER
MAUNG, Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *three* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will
  be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this
  communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Mar 20, 2001*

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
  closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the applica

  4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

  a)☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐None of:

    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on August 20,

2001. Claims 1-22 are presented for further examination.

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102

that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent
by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant
for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the
requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before
the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3.   Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by

Scherpbier, U.S. Patent Number 5,944,791 (hereinafter Scherpbier).

4.   As per claim 1, Scherpbier discloses a system and method for remotely

controlling another client computer in a network (see abstract and figure 1).

Scherpbier discloses the invention as claimed. As per claim 1, Scherpbier discloses a

system for remotely accessing a client in a client server system comprising a browser

for requesting remote access (see figure 1, piolet computer 18 with browser 20, column

3, line 40 to column 4, line 50); a client machine further comprised of a listening

program responsive to requests for remote access and a client agent for

communicating with the browser and a server machine (see figure 1, column 3, line 40

to column 6, line 54, the passenger computer browser 26 for communicating with the

pilot browser 20 and control or server computer 12).

5.   As per claim 2, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 1, wherein the browser requests access to

a client machine by sending a universal resource locator containing a machine name

and a port number over a network (see column 4, line 30 to column 5, line 54, flight

request including identification of the intended passenger computer with browser 26,

passenger applets 22. The passenger computer 24 accesses the control module using

browser 26 and appropriate URL to download boarding applet).

6.   As per claim 3, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 2, wherein the listening program in the

client machine is listening on the port number, and establishes communications with

the browser over a second port number in response to the request for access (see

column 4, line 30 to column 5, line 54).

7.   As per claim 4, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 3, wherein the listening program spawns

the client agent to communicate with the browser and the server (see column 4, line 30

to column 5, line 54).

8.   As per claim 5, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 4, wherein the client agent sends the

browser an applet further comprising graphical user interface to execute on the browser

(see column 4, line 30 to column 5, line 54, pilot applet 22).

9.   As per claim 6, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the applet executes in the

national language and locale of the browser (see column 3, line 40 to column 5, line

54).

10.   As per claim 7, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the browser is located on the

server machine (see figure 1, column 3 line 40 to column 5, line 54).

11.   As per claim 8, Scherpbier discloses the system for remotely accessing a client

in a client server system as claimed in claim 5, wherein the graphical user interface is a

command line interface (see column 5, lines 1-35).

12.   As per claims 9-22, they do not teach or further define over the limitations

recited in claims 1-8. Therefore, claims 9-22 are also rejected for the same reasons set

forth in claims 1-8, _supra_.

13.   Applicant's arguments filed on August 20, 2001 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive.

As per applicants' arguments filed on August 20, 2001, the applicants argued

that "The present invention discloses a method whereby the user of a first computer

establishes communications with an unattended second computer that is networked to

the first computer via the; Web. The second computer is running a listening program

that is responsive to requests for remote access. Communication with the second

computer is established by sending the access request using a Web browser and by

specifying a URL containing a machine name and a port number, which identify the

second computer and the port on the second computer through which the listening

program receives remote access requests, over the network. A client agent running on

the unattended second computer establishes communication with a third (server)

computer and with the browser running on the first computer. Via the browser running

on the first computer, the operation of the second computer and communications

between the second computer and the third computer can be controlled in real time.

In reply, all those detailed limitations are not included in the claims.

The applicants further argued that there is no listening program, no identifiable

port to which access requests are sent, and no client agent for establishing real time

communications between the first and third computer in Scherpbier.

In reply, Scherpbier discloses the invention as claimed. Scherpbier discloses a

system for remotely accessing a client in a client server system comprising a browser

for requesting remote access (see figure 1, piolet computer 18 with browser 20, column

3, line 40 to column 4, line 50); a client machine further comprised of a listening

program responsive to requests for remote access and a client agent for

communicating with the browser and a server machine (see figure 1, column 3, line 40

to column 6, line 54, the passenger computer browser 26 for communicating with the

pilot browser 20 and control or server computer 12. The listening program is inherently

included in the browser 26, because browser). Scherpbier further discloses the

browser requests access to a client machine by sending a universal resource locator

containing a machine name and a port number over a network (see column 4, line 30

to column 5, line 54, flight request including identification of the intended passenger

computer with browser 26, passenger applets 22. The passenger computer 24

accesses the control module using browser 26 and appropriate URL to download

boarding applet. The port is inherently included in the passenger browser and

passenger applet interface).

14.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zarni Maung whose telephone number is (703) 308-6687. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng Ai, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

October 25, 2001

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER